



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

Environmental Assessment Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects 24 CFR Part 58

Project Information

Project Name: The-Waypoint

HEROS Number: 900000010103385

Project Location: 3846 King St, Alexandria, VA 22302

Additional Location Information:

The project is located to the rear of the existing Fairlington Presbyterian Church structure with which it will share a lot.

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

The Project is located on the grounds of the of Fairlington Presbyterian Church at 3846 King St., Alexandria, VA. The project includes the redevelopment of a portion of the Church's surface parking lot with a new four-story affordable multi-family building of 81 units, including a mix of one-, two- and three-bedroom units available at 40-60% Area Median Income (AMI). The apartment building would be a four-story U-shaped structure with a footprint of approximately 25,000 square feet. The proposed building is approximately 137,000 gross square feet. The building design incorporates a red brick base with limited use of a light-white fiber-cement panel along the upper floors and is designed to echo the garden style apartments and townhomes in the surrounding area. An underground parking garage would provide 83 parking spaces and meet the City of Alexandria's residential parking requirements within the garage. The proposed building would be located in the existing parking area, and new surface parking areas will be constructed to the east and west of the Church buildings, with a section of double parking situated between the Church and the residential building. The apartment building would be constructed with an interior landscaped courtyard facing the Church building. The building will be designed and constructed in accordance with green building principles and will achieve at least a "silver" rating under EarthCraft Virginia certification. The site plan aims to fulfill the Church's desire to include a portion of parking on the front lawn to allow easy entrance into the Church through the main doors; place the main entrance to the residential building garage and parking near Menokin Drive to allow school visitors to enter near the education wing; and simultaneously maximize green space. The reconfigured surface parking lots further allow preservation of the meaningful pine trees on the Church along with the creation of new, landscaped greenspace directly north and south of the Church and within the apartment building courtyard. The existing playground, located behind the church structure, will be relocated in front of the church, fenced-in and landscaped to create a safe and visually appealing design that does not detract from the church's appearance. Additional landscaping will be added around the site, along Menokin Drive and the King Street Access road. Vehicular access to the church parking lot will be maintained with the existing drive aisle from the King Street Access Road, and a curbcut along Menokin

Drive, which has been relocated to reduce traffic conflict at the intersection of Menokin Drive and N. Van Dorn Street. Before the start of building construction, the church congregation intends to move the playground to the front of the Church. This process will involve the removal of the existing playground equipment from behind the Church and the installation of new equipment, fencing, and landscaping in front of the Church. Some ground disturbance will be necessary for the installation of the fencing and the landscaping, but it will be minimal. In order to construct the main building, the developer will excavate the existing parking lot area and some of the land area surrounding the Church. This is necessary for the placement of the building's foundations as well as the construction of the parking garage and the undergrounding of utilities as required by the City. While construction is occurring, the developer will be required to follow sediment and erosion control procedures and obey City noise ordinances limiting construction hours. The developer will also be required to provide off-street parking for all workers in order to minimize disturbance to the surrounding community. After construction is completed, the developer will install a new parking lot and landscaping around the building and the Church. The developer has entered into an agreement with the Church to acquire the land.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
770	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$1,000,000.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$38,000,000.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.


Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition
Permits, reviews, and approvals	City of Alexandria (COA) Development Special Use Permit (includes review by most City departments) Virginia Stormwater Management Plan General Permit COA Construction Management Plan COA Building Permits COA Board of Architectural Review Virginia Department of Historic Resources Review Virginia Department of Environmental Quality Coastal Zone Management Federal Consistency Review

Mitigation Plan

The mitigation measures above are all requirements for project construction and completion. Some of them, such as the reviews by the Department of Environmental Quality, the Board of Architectural Review, and the Department of Historic Resources, have already concluded. Others, such as the COA Construction Management Plan, are required in order for construction to proceed. All of the mitigation measures and conditions are either stipulated in federal, state, or local law or included in the terms of the Development Special Unit Permit. Because successful fulfillment of all mitigation measures and conditions is required to receive a Certificate of Occupancy for the project, the developer's project manager will be monitoring the measures and conditions necessary for City approval. The projected timeframe for construction and completion of all mitigation measures and conditions is late 2021-early 2022.

Determination:


<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.13] The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of human environment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Finding of Significant Impact

Preparer Signature:  Date: 4/13/20

Name / Title/ Organization: Kimberly Daragan-Cadena / / ALEXANDRIA

Certifying Officer Signature:  Date: 4-15-20Name/ Title: Mark B. Jinks, City Manager

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).


Christina Johnson Brown
Deputy City Attorney
Approved as to Form

**Environmental Assessment
Determinations and Compliance Findings
for HUD-assisted Projects
24 CFR Part 58**

Project Information

Project Name: The-Waypoint

HEROS Number: 900000010103385

Responsible Entity (RE): ALEXANDRIA, CITY HALL ALEXANDRIA VA, 22314

RE Preparer: Kimberly Daragan-Cadena

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: Mark Jinks

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Point of Contact:

Consultant (if applicable):

Point of Contact:

Project Location: 3846 King St, Alexandria, VA 22302

Additional Location Information:

The project is located to the rear of the existing Fairlington Presbyterian Church structure with which it will share a lot.

Direct Comments to:

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

The Project is located on the grounds of the of Fairlington Presbyterian Church at 3846 King St., Alexandria, VA. The project includes the redevelopment of a portion of the Church's surface parking lot with a new four-story affordable multi-family building of 81 units, including a mix of one-, two- and three-bedroom units available at 40-60% Area Median Income (AMI). The apartment building would be a four-story U-shaped structure with a footprint of approximately 25,000 square feet. The proposed building is approximately 137,000 gross square feet. The building design incorporates a red brick base with limited use of a light-white fiber-cement panel along the upper floors and is designed to echo the garden style apartments and townhomes in the surrounding area. An underground parking garage would provide 83 parking spaces and meet the City of Alexandria's residential parking requirements within the garage. The proposed building would be located in the existing parking area, and new surface parking areas will be constructed to the east and west of the Church buildings, with a section of double parking situated between the Church and the residential building. The apartment building would be constructed with an interior landscaped courtyard facing the Church building. The building will be designed and constructed in accordance with green building principles and will achieve at least a "silver" rating under EarthCraft Virginia certification. The site plan aims to fulfill the Church's desire to include a portion of parking on the front lawn to allow easy entrance into the Church through the main doors; place the main entrance to the residential building garage and parking near Menokin Drive to allow school visitors to enter near the education wing; and simultaneously maximize green space. The reconfigured surface parking lots further allow preservation of the meaningful pine trees on the Church along with the creation of new, landscaped greenspace directly north and south of the Church and within the apartment building courtyard. The existing playground, located behind the church structure, will be relocated in front of the church, fenced-in and landscaped to create a safe and visually appealing design that does not detract from the church's appearance. Additional landscaping will be added around the site, along Menokin Drive and the King Street Access road. Vehicular access to the church parking lot will be maintained with the existing drive aisle from the King Street Access Road, and a curbcut along Menokin Drive, which has been relocated to reduce traffic conflict at the intersection of Menokin Drive and N. Van Dorn Street. Before the start of building construction, the church congregation intends to move the playground to the front of the Church. This process will involve the removal of the existing playground equipment from behind the Church and the installation of new equipment, fencing, and landscaping in front of the Church. Some ground disturbance will be necessary for the installation of the fencing and the landscaping, but it will be minimal. In order to construct the main building, the developer will excavate the existing parking lot area and some of the land area surrounding the Church. This is necessary for the placement of the building's foundations as well as the construction of the parking garage and the undergrounding of utilities as required by the City. While construction is occurring, the developer will be required to follow sediment and erosion control procedures and obey City noise ordinances limiting construction hours. The developer will also be required to provide off-street parking for all workers in order to minimize disturbance to the surrounding community. After construction is completed, the developer will install a new parking lot and landscaping around the building and the Church. The developer has entered into an agreement with the Church to acquire the land.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

The City of Alexandria and the surrounding Washington D.C. metropolitan area have a shortage of affordable housing which is predicted to increase greatly over the next ten years. The City of Alexandria had already committed to producing 2,000 new affordable

units between 2014-2023. Because of the 2019 Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments report on the housing shortfall in the Washington DC region, the City Council unanimously endorsed a goal of producing 3,000 more units, 75% of them affordable, by 2030. This project will provide 81 new units of rental housing affordable to households making 40% - 60% AMI and help the City reach its unit production goal. Alternatives such as reducing the number of units or not proceeding with the project will make it more difficult for the City and region to reach their housing targets.

Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:

The project is the redevelopment of an existing, underused church parking lot. The church occupies the front of the lot the project will occupy. The surrounding area is a mix of strip-mall retail, garden-style multifamily residential, and townhouses. None of these structures are more than four stories in height. A little further away, the neighborhood changes to single-family detached houses. The church, apartments, and townhouses are colonial style, constructed of brick which is either painted white or left unpainted. It is unlikely the nature of the area will change significantly in the future, especially because the neighborhood directly across King Street from the project is on the National Historic Register. There is a retail shopping center to the southeast of the project.

Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:[Photo Map\(1\).pdf](#)[Waypoint Photos Historic.pdf](#)**Determination:**

✓	Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.13] The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of human environment
	Finding of Significant Impact

Approval Documents:**7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer****on:****7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer****on:****Funding Information**

Grant / Project Identification	HUD Program	Program Name
--------------------------------	-------------	--------------

Number		
770	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program

**Estimated Total HUD Funded, \$1,000,000.00
Assisted or Insured Amount:**

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$38,000,000.00

Compliance with 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5 and §58.6 Laws and Authorities

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. As shown on the maps generated by NEPAassist on September 26, 2019, there are no civilian airports within 2,500 feet of the project and no military airports within 15,000 feet of the project.
Coastal Barrier Resources Act Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is not located in a CBRS Unit. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Unit and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. The City of Alexandria has no Coastal Barrier Resource System Units, as shown on the map generated by the USFWS on September 19, 2019. There is no condition requiring compliance.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood

		insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements. According to the FIRMette map exported on August 9, 2019 the project is in Zone X, an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard. This designation was effective as of June 16, 2011.
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5		
Air Quality Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project's county or air quality management district is in non-attainment status for the following: Ozone. Any impact from the project will be negated by reductions in emissions from other large producers of ozone precursors in the City. In addition, the project will be Earthcraft Silver certified, as per City regulations, and will use low- or no-VOC materials during construction. The project is also required to have a Transportation Management Plan designed to minimize the number of single-occupant vehicle trips by the residents and therefore minimize additional vehicle emissions. These negations and actions will ensure the ozone level will remain below the emissions levels or the screening level established by the state or air quality management district for the pollutant(s) identified above. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.
Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is located in a Coastal Zone, but it has been determined to be consistent with the State Coastal Management Program. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. See letter from Julie Wellman, EIR coordinator for the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, dated 2/14/20.
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health

		and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. The report prepared by Meyer Consulting Engineers on August 6, 2019, found no RECs on or around the site. These conclusions can be found on pages 11, 12, and 14. The full report is attached.
Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. See the attached letter dated August 6, 2019 from US FWS.
Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. This information was confirmed with William Shelton, Fire Marshal, Arlington County Fire Department. See attached.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. The project is entirely contained within the City of Alexandria, which is in the Washington DC Urban Area as designated by the Census. See the attached TIGER Web map generated on September 19, 2019.
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988. The site is entirely within an area designated FEMA Zone X, an Area of Minimum Flood Hazard. This designation was effective June 16, 2011 and is shown on the FIRMette map exported August 9, 2019.
Historic Preservation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Based on Section 106 consultation the

<p>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>		<p>project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. This determination is based on the location of the project, which has no historic properties within its area of direct effect and historic properties within a small area of indirect effect. The historic properties are not near the project site and are separated from the site by a major roadway and a church. The church building will block the view of most of the project, reducing any small impact on the historic properties. The following parties concur with this determination (their concurrences are attached): City of Alexandria (COA) Archaeology COA Board of Architectural Review staff Arlington County Historic Preservation Program staff Virginia Department of Historic Resources (SHPO) Pamunkey Indian Tribe Catawba Indian Nation The Delaware Nation, Oklahoma and the Office of Historic Alexandria were invited to consult but did not reply within the response period.</p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>A Noise Assessment was conducted. Exhibit V-9 on page 71 of the FAR PART 150 NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS AND NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM for Ronald Reagan National Airport was used to determine the level of airplane noise exposure. Sheet C-0402 of the Final Site Plan for the Fairlington Presbyterian Development was used to determine the closest part of the building relative to the property line and surrounding streets. Average Daily Traffic counts were obtained from the Virginia Department of Transportation on 11/25/19 (https://www.virginiaroads.org/datasets/traffic-volume). The distance between the building and roads was calculated in ArcGIS. There are no railroads within 1,000 feet of the site. The noise level was acceptable: 62.0 db. See noise</p>

		analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. (As N Van Dorn St is classified as a minor arterial by VA DOT, the distance between the building and the intersection of N Van Dorn St and Menokin Dr was used as the effective distance. The effective distance to King St was calculated as the distance to the King St principal arterial and not to the local road that parallels it, as the VA DOT traffic counts are for the principal arterial, not the local road.)
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. As shown on the map generated on September 19, 2019, there are no sole source aquifers in the City of Alexandria. The project is located entirely within the City of Alexandria.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. See attached map generated on September 26, 2019.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. See the attached map generated 9/26/19.
HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS		
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 & 1508.27]

Impact Codes: An impact code from the following list has been used to make the determination of impact for each factor.

- (1) Minor beneficial impact
- (2) No impact anticipated
- (3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation

(4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	1	The project has been approved by the City's Planning and Zoning board and the developers have agreed to all City stipulations. City staff concluded the project is consistent with the objective of the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Master Plan, the Housing Master Plan and the underlying RA Zoning. The project is of comparable height to surrounding buildings and will be constructed of materials which match those of the existing church and complement those used in the surrounding neighborhood. Community input was utilized when deciding on the exterior colors for the building. The project will have a slight aesthetic benefit to the community because of the required undergrounding of utilities on the property.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	1	City maps indicate there are no marine clay deposits on the site and the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment found no highly erodible soils on the site. The site is nearly level. Currently, the site has no stormwater controls. The project will include the installation of stormwater controls which will reduce stormwater flow during 2-year and 10-year rain events to below pre-development levels. Water quality will also be improved as 89% of the runoff will be treated on site and the developer will make a contribution to the City's Water Quality Fund as mitigation for the other 11%.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	The project is not in a high-hazard area and is unlikely to be affected by natural disasters. There are no significant man-made hazards in the area and the project is set well back from the closest major arterial road. The project is a residential	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		development and will not generate excessive noise.	
Energy Consumption/Energy Efficiency	2	The project is required to comply with the City's Green Building Policy and will be Earthcraft Silver certified. All appliances in the project will be Energy Star appliances. The developer is required to file and follow a Transportation Management Plan to discourage residents from taking single-occupant car trips and use alternate modes of transport. Taken together, these actions result in the minimization of the project's impact on the energy supply and energy consumption.	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	The project will not have any long-term effects on employment and income patterns. Because of the project's income requirements and the strong demand for housing in Alexandria, it is expected the project will house people who are already working in Alexandria or surrounding area. The short-term effect on employment will be to generate more construction and related jobs. The developer will be informed of federal Section 3 requirements (regardless of whether the project triggers them) and will be encouraged to hire low-income people and minorities.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	As the site is currently a parking lot, no residents will be displaced by the project. The project might result in a slight demographic change in the neighborhood depending on how the demographics of the project residents compare to the demographics of the surrounding neighborhood.	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	Alexandria City Public Schools staff and City staff worked together to analyze the potential effect of the project on school	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		enrollment and factor that effect into future school needs projections. The TC Williams and Minnie Howard high school campuses are less than a mile from the project site, as is Episcopal High School. Northern Virginia Community College's Alexandria Campus is just over a mile away. The project will share its site with the Potomac Crescent Waldorf school. Cultural and recreation facilities nearby include the Burke Library and the Chinguapin Aquatics and Recreation Center, which are both approximately a mile from the site. Other cultural facilities such as museums and theaters can be accessed easily via public transit, bicycle, or car.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	The project is within walking distance of a commercial shopping center which contains a supermarket, a bank, a post office, an urgent care center, a pharmacy, and multiple restaurants. Just beyond that shopping center and still within walking distance is another supermarket which also contains a pharmacy. The project is within a quarter-mile of I-395, which provides access to many other major shopping centers. Shopping centers and specialty stores are also accessible via public transit along King Street.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	There are two pharmacies and an urgent care center within walking distance. Inova Alexandria Hospital is less than a mile away and the site's location near major highways offers access to specialized services and hospitals in the metro area. Other medical services can be accessed via car, bike, or public transit within a reasonable period of time. No comments on capacity were received from the Alexandria Health Department during the departmental review period. The project developer provides limited social services	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		to all of the residents of its developments and the church which shares the site also provides some services to community members. As the project is intended to house individuals and families earning 40% - 60% AMI, it is not anticipated that there will be high demand for such services as addiction counseling, programs for the elderly and disabled, or supportive housing. If such needs do arise, services can be accessed via car or public transit. No comments were received from the Department of Community and Human Services during the review period.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	No comments were received regarding capacity from Transportation & Environmental Services' Resource Recovery Division, which manages the City's solid waste disposal and recycling programs. As a condition of their permit, the developer is required to work with Resource Recovery to ensure the reuse and recycling of as much construction material as possible. During construction, the developer will be required to implement a waste and refuse control program as part of the overall construction management plan. Subsequent solid waste and recycling will be handled by Resource Recovery.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The project will be connected to the City's sanitary sewer system. Downstream outfall analysis has determined the existing sanitary sewer system has the capacity to handle the new peak flow from the project.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Virginia Water will be supplying the project with water. No comments were received from them regarding water supply issues. To minimize water consumption, EPA-certified WaterSense fixtures will be used throughout the building.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The Alexandria Fire Department has confirmed they will be able to provide appropriate fire response in case of an emergency and that the project conforms to all requirements. Furthermore, the developer has agreed to work with the Fire Department to satisfy all of its recommendations for the project. During the City review of the site plan, which is open to comments from all City departments, the Police Department submitted recommendations for improving the safety of the project, but made no comments about the project affecting capacity or response time. No comments on emergency medical capacity were received during the city review period. The nearest emergency medical facility is less than a mile from the project site at Inova Hospital.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	The project will have open space in the form of a courtyard in front of the building as well as an area of the parking lot that can be closed off to allow for community gatherings. There is also a playground which will be located in front of the church on the project site that will be open to building residents when not in use by the Waldorf school run by the church. The City's approval of the Final Site Plan included approval of the amount of open space required on the site. The site is also less than a half-mile from Fort Ward Park, one of the larger open space areas in the city.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	Overall, the site is well served by vehicular access as King Street is primary transportation corridor in the City and entrance ramps to Interstate 395 North and South are within a quarter-mile of the project site. The site is served by multiple bus lines, including the AT Series (AT6, AT5, and AT9) and 22F with service to	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		Northern Virginia Community College, King Street Metro, Potomac Yard Shopping Center, Mark Center, Braddock Metro, Landmark Mall, Eisenhower Metro, Van Dorn Metro and the Pentagon. The project developer is required to improve the adjacent bus stops as part of the project, which will benefit new and existing commuters. The curb cuts and driveways serving the site were placed after consultation with the community, the City, and project engineers to minimize the project's impact on traffic flow and circulation. The project is also required to conform to a Transportation Management Plan filed with the City which details how the owner intends to discourage single-occupancy vehicle trips. Vehicle and pedestrian safety is enhanced by the presence of an access road paralleling King St, protecting slower local traffic from the faster traffic on the main arterial. Sidewalks provide access to nearby amenities and road crossings are signalized and have marked crosswalks. On- and off-street bike trails connect the site with parks, recreation centers, schools, and Metro stations.	
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	1	There are no unique natural features or water resources in proximity to this project. The project is not located in a Resource Protection Area. It is located in the Four Mile Run watershed. The project will comply with City regulations requiring drains which empty into the watershed to be labeled as such and will follow Stormwater Best Management Practices to limit flow into the watershed (see above). The stormwater mitigation measures required for the project will reduce the flow and increase the water quality of the water flowing from the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		project site to Four Mile Run over what it is currently.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	1	The project intends to retain as many trees as possible that are currently on the site and will increase the amount of on-site vegetation by converting areas that are currently paved to grass. Canopy cover will increase 5% over pre-development amounts. As the project is on a pre-existing paved parking lot, no wildlife impacts are anticipated.	
Other Factors			

Supporting documentation

[Sewer Analysis.pdf](#)
[Open Space Plan.pdf](#)
[Green Building Application.pdf](#)
[3846 King St Area Map.pdf](#)
[Context Map.pdf](#)
[Zoning Consistency.pdf](#)
[Water Resources.pdf](#)
[Solid Waste.pdf](#)
[Energy Efficiency.pdf](#)
[Education.pdf](#)
[Stormwater answer.pdf](#)
[Fire response answer.pdf](#)

Additional Studies Performed:**Field Inspection [Optional]:** Date and completed

by:

Kimberly Daragan-Cadena

12/23/2019 12:00:00 AM

[Photo Map\(1\).pdf](#)
[Waypoint Photos Historic.pdf](#)

List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

Agencies: Wesley Housing City of Alexandria Office of Housing City of Alexandria
 Transportation & Environmental Services Office of Historic Alexandria Alexandria
 Archaeology City of Alexandria Board of Architectural Review Staff Arlington County

Historic Preservation Program Delaware Nation, Oklahoma Catawba Indian Nation
Pamunkey Indian Tribe Virginia Department of Environmental Quality Virginia
Department of Historic Resources Alexandria Fire Department Arlington Fire
Department US Fish and Wildlife Service FEMA Sources: Fairlington Presbyterian
Development- Final Site Plan prepared by Walter L. Phillips Inc. City of Alexandria
Development Special Use Permit #2017-0006 Fairlington Presbyterian Residential
Development Traffic Impact Analysis by Wells & Associates Virginia Department of
Transportation Traffic Volume Data Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport FAR
Part 150 Noise Exposure Maps and Noise Compatibility Program prepared for the
Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority City of Alexandria GIS Maps Persons: Lorin
Farris, Arlington County Dept. of Community Planning, Housing & Development Susan
Hellman, City of Alexandria Dept. of Planning and Zoning Khoa Tran, City of Alexandria
Transportation & Environmental Services Valerie Fulcher, Virginia Dept. of
Environmental Quality Caitlin Rogers, Catawba Indian Nation Robert Gray, Pamunkey
Indian Tribe Deborah Dotson, Delaware Indian Nation Garret Fesler, Alexandria
Archaeology William Shelton, Arlington Fire Department Laura Lavernia, Virginia Dept.
of Historic Resources

List of Permits Obtained:

City of Alexandria (COA) Development Special Use Permit (includes review by most City
departments) Virginia Stormwater Management Plan General Permit COA Construction
Management Plan COA Building Permits COA Board of Architectural Review Virginia
Department of Historic Resources Review Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Coastal Zone Management Federal Consistency Review

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

Prior to and during the process of filing of a site plan with the City, the developer and
Fairlington Presbyterian Church held thirteen public and community meetings to inform
the community about the project and solicit feedback about the design. They used this
feedback to inform the design of the building so it would be appropriate for its
surroundings. Community members also spoke at public Planning Commission and City
Council hearings for and against the project and submitted questions about the project
which were then answered by the developer or City staff members. Some of these
questions involved environmental or historic resource concerns. Planning Commission
members took into account public comments and concerns before approving the
project with conditions.

[Dissemination List.docx](#)
[Community Outreach.pdf](#)

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

In general, the effect of the project is in line with existing trends and will not exacerbate any one trend unduly. Schools, public transportation, utility infrastructure, traffic and community impact were all evaluated during the public planning process over the past few years.

Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]

The project as submitted is the final version of the site plan. The first version of the plan submitted was an L-shaped building with curb cuts and the garage entrance closer to King Street. City staff recommended the developer modify the plan to reduce possible traffic congestion, allow for better site circulation, and reconfigure parking options. The applicant did so to the City's satisfaction. Early versions of the plan also had color and exterior material choices which were not consistent with the neighborhood character. Based on feedback from the City and the community, the developer altered the color and materials to better integrate the building with the surrounding structures. No other sites were considered because the project is dependent on the use of the specific site in order to proceed. Other uses were not considered because the site owner decided housing was the only use they wanted for the site.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

If no action is taken, the church will continue to use the parking lot, but not to its full capacity. 81 households in the city of Alexandria and surrounding region will continue to be housing-cost burdened or live in substandard housing. Traffic volume will remain the same or increase slightly based on future conditions. Stormwater runoff from the site will remain at the same level and will flow untreated into storm sewers.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The project will benefit the community in providing much needed affordable housing for 81 low-income households. Because the effect of the project is in line with existing trends while providing a necessary community benefit, the City finds the project will have No Significant Impact on the environment.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
Permits,	City of Alexandria (COA) Development	N/A	

reviews and approvals	Special Use Permit (includes review by most City departments) Virginia Stormwater Management Plan General Permit COA Construction Management Plan COA Building Permits COA Board of Architectural Review Virginia Department of Historic Resources Review Virginia Department of Environmental Quality Coastal Zone Management Federal Consistency Review		
-----------------------	---	--	--

Mitigation Plan

The mitigation measures above are all requirements for project construction and completion. Some of them, such as the reviews by the Department of Environmental Quality, the Board of Architectural Review, and the Department of Historic Resources, have already concluded. Others, such as the COA Construction Management Plan, are required in order for construction to proceed. All of the mitigation measures and conditions are either stipulated in federal, state, or local law or included in the terms of the Development Special Unit Permit. Because successful fulfillment of all mitigation measures and conditions is required to receive a Certificate of Occupancy for the project, the developer's project manager will be monitoring the measures and conditions necessary for City approval. The projected timeframe for construction and completion of all mitigation measures and conditions is late 2021-early 2022.

Supporting documentation on completed measures

APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities**Airport Hazards**

General policy	Legislation	Regulation
It is HUD's policy to apply standards to prevent incompatible development around civil airports and military airfields.		24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D

1. To ensure compatible land use development, you must determine your site's proximity to civil and military airports. Is your project within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport?

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload the map showing that the site is not within the applicable distances to a military or civilian airport below

Yes

Screen Summary**Compliance Determination**

The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. As shown on the maps generated by NEPAassist on September 26, 2019, there are no civilian airports within 2,500 feet of the project and no military airports within 15,000 feet of the project.

Supporting documentation

[Civilian Airport Hazards Map.pdf](#)

[Military Airport Hazards Map.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Barrier Resources

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD financial assistance may not be used for most activities in units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS). See 16 USC 3504 for limitations on federal expenditures affecting the CBRS.	Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) of 1982, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 USC 3501)	

1. Is the project located in a CBRS Unit?

☒ No

Document and upload map and documentation below.

Yes

Compliance Determination

This project is not located in a CBRS Unit. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Unit and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. The City of Alexandria has no Coastal Barrier Resource System Units, as shown on the map generated by the USFWS on September 19, 2019. There is no condition requiring compliance.

Supporting documentation

[Alexandria Coastal Barrier Resources Map.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

☒ No

Flood Insurance

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Certain types of federal financial assistance may not be used in floodplains unless the community participates in National Flood Insurance Program and flood insurance is both obtained and maintained.	Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 as amended (42 USC 4001-4128)	24 CFR 50.4(b)(1) and 24 CFR 58.6(a) and (b); 24 CFR 55.1(b).

1. Does this project involve financial assistance for construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of a mobile home, building, or insurable personal property?

No. This project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance.

✓ Yes

2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:

[FIRM Flood Map.pdf](#)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The [FEMA Map Service Center](#) provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use the best available information to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site. Provide FEMA/FIRM floodplain zone designation, panel number, and date within your documentation.

Is the structure, part of the structure, or insurable property located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area?

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD

recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements. According to the FIRMette map exported on August 9, 2019 the project is in Zone X, an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard. This designation was effective as of June 16, 2011.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Air Quality

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Clean Air Act is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which sets national standards on ambient pollutants. In addition, the Clean Air Act is administered by States, which must develop State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to regulate their state air quality. Projects funded by HUD must demonstrate that they conform to the appropriate SIP.	Clean Air Act (42 USC 7401 et seq.) as amended particularly Section 176(c) and (d) (42 USC 7506(c) and (d))	40 CFR Parts 6, 51 and 93

1. Does your project include new construction or conversion of land use facilitating the development of public, commercial, or industrial facilities OR five or more dwelling units?

✓ Yes

No

Air Quality Attainment Status of Project's County or Air Quality Management District

2. Is your project's air quality management district or county in non-attainment or maintenance status for any criteria pollutants?

No, project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants.

✓ Yes, project's management district or county is in non-attainment or maintenance status for the following criteria pollutants (check all that apply):

Carbon Monoxide

Lead

Nitrogen dioxide

Sulfur dioxide

- ✓ Ozone
- Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns
- Particulate Matter, <10 microns

3. What are the *de minimis* emissions levels (40 CFR 93.153) or screening levels for the non-attainment or maintenance level pollutants indicated above

Ozone 0.07 ppb (parts per million)

Provide your source used to determine levels here:

<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2015-10-26/pdf/2015-26594.pdf>

4. Determine the estimated emissions levels of your project. Will your project exceed any of the *de minimis* or threshold emissions levels of non-attainment and maintenance level pollutants or exceed the screening levels established by the state or air quality management district?

- ✓ No, the project will not exceed *de minimis* or threshold emissions levels or screening levels.

Enter the estimate emission levels:

Ozone ppb (parts per million)

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes, the project exceeds *de minimis* emissions levels or screening levels.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project's county or air quality management district is in non-attainment status for the following: Ozone. Any impact from the project will be negated by reductions in emissions from other large producers of ozone precursors in the City. In addition, the project will be Earthcraft Silver certified, as per City regulations, and will use low- or no-VOC materials during construction. The project is also required to have a Transportation Management Plan designed to minimize the number of single-occupant vehicle trips by the residents and therefore minimize additional vehicle emissions. These negations and

actions will ensure the ozone level will remain below the emissions levels or the screening level established by the state or air quality management district for the pollutant(s) identified above. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

Supporting documentation

[Air Quality Memo.doc](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Zone Management Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Federal assistance to applicant agencies for activities affecting any coastal use or resource is granted only when such activities are consistent with federally approved State Coastal Zone Management Act Plans.	Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC 1451-1464), particularly section 307(c) and (d) (16 USC 1456(c) and (d))	15 CFR Part 930

1. Is the project located in, or does it affect, a Coastal Zone as defined in your state Coastal Management Plan?

☒ Yes

No

2. Does this project include new construction, conversion, major rehabilitation, or substantial improvement activities?

☒ Yes

No

3. Has this project been determined to be consistent with the State Coastal Management Program?

☒ Yes, without mitigation

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Yes, with mitigation

No, project must be canceled.

Screen Summary**Compliance Determination**

This project is located in a Coastal Zone, but it has been determined to be consistent with the State Coastal Management Program. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. See letter from Julie Wellman, EIR coordinator for the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, dated 2/14/20.

Supporting documentation

[DEQ CZMA letter reduced.pdf](#)

[02 14 20 signed IR 4136 Waypoint.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Contamination and Toxic Substances

General requirements	Legislation	Regulations
It is HUD policy that all properties that are being proposed for use in HUD programs be free of hazardous materials, contamination, toxic chemicals and gases, and radioactive substances, where a hazard could affect the health and safety of the occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property.		24 CFR 58.5(i)(2) 24 CFR 50.3(i)

1. How was site contamination evaluated? Select all that apply. Document and upload documentation and reports and evaluation explanation of site contamination below.

- ☒ American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)
ASTM Phase II ESA
Remediation or clean-up plan
ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening
None of the Above

2. Were any on-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property? (Were any recognized environmental conditions or RECs identified in a Phase I ESA and confirmed in a Phase II ESA?)

- ☒ No

Explain:

The ASTM Phase I ESA prepared by Meyer Consulting Engineers identified no RECs on or around the property that would affect the health and safety of the project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

Screen Summary**Compliance Determination**

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. The report prepared by Meyer Consulting Engineers on August 6, 2019, found no RECs on or around the site. These conclusions can be found on pages 11, 12, and 14. The full report is attached.

Supporting documentation

[Phase 1 ESA.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Endangered Species

General requirements	ESA Legislation	Regulations
Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) mandates that federal agencies ensure that actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out shall not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed plants and animals or result in the adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat. Where their actions may affect resources protected by the ESA, agencies must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service ("FWS" and "NMFS" or "the Services").	The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 <i>et seq.</i>); particularly section 7 (16 USC 1536).	50 CFR Part 402

1. Does the project involve any activities that have the potential to affect species or habitats?

No, the project will have No Effect due to the nature of the activities involved in the project.

No, the project will have No Effect based on a letter of understanding, memorandum of agreement, programmatic agreement, or checklist provided by local HUD office

- ✓ Yes, the activities involved in the project have the potential to affect species and/or habitats.

2. Are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area?

- ✓ No, the project will have No Effect due to the absence of federally listed species and designated critical habitat

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Documentation may include letters from the Services, species lists from the Services' websites, surveys or other documents and analysis showing that there are no species in the action area.

Yes, there are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. See the attached letter dated August 6, 2019 from US FWS.

Supporting documentation

[FWS Endangered Species Letter.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Explosive and Flammable Hazards

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD-assisted projects must meet Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) requirements to protect them from explosive and flammable hazards.	N/A	24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C

1. Is the proposed HUD-assisted project itself the development of a hazardous facility (a facility that mainly stores, handles or processes flammable or combustible chemicals such as bulk fuel storage facilities and refineries)?

✓ No

Yes

2. Does this project include any of the following activities: development, construction, rehabilitation that will increase residential densities, or conversion?

No

✓ Yes

3. Within 1 mile of the project site, are there any current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers that are covered by 24 CFR 51C? Containers that are NOT covered under the regulation include:

- Containers 100 gallons or less in capacity, containing common liquid industrial fuels OR

- Containers of liquified petroleum gas (LPG) or propane with a water volume capacity of 1,000 gallons or less that meet the requirements of the 2017 or later version of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code 58.

If all containers within the search area fit the above criteria, answer "No." For any other type of aboveground storage container within the search area that holds one of the flammable or explosive materials listed in Appendix I of 24 CFR part 51 subpart C, answer "Yes."

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Yes

Screen Summary**Compliance Determination**

There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. This information was confirmed with William Shelton, Fire Marshal, Arlington County Fire Department. See attached.

Supporting documentation

[Explosive Hazards Environmental Assessment for 3846 King Street.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Farmlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) discourages federal activities that would convert farmland to nonagricultural purposes.	Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.)	7 CFR Part 658

1. Does your project include any activities, including new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, that could convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use?

Yes

☒ No

If your project includes new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, explain how you determined that agricultural land would not be converted:

The project is the redevelopment of an existing parking lot.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Screen Summary**Compliance Determination**

This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. The project is entirely contained within the City of Alexandria, which is in the Washington DC Urban Area as designated by the Census. See the attached TIGER Web map generated on September 19, 2019.

Supporting documentation

[Census Urban Area Map \(Farmland\).pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

☒ No

Floodplain Management

General Requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, requires federal activities to avoid impacts to floodplains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development to the extent practicable.	Executive Order 11988	24 CFR 55

1. Do any of the following exemptions apply? Select the applicable citation? [only one selection possible]

55.12(c)(3)

55.12(c)(4)

55.12(c)(5)

55.12(c)(6)

55.12(c)(7)

55.12(c)(8)

55.12(c)(9)

55.12(c)(10)

55.12(c)(11)

☒ None of the above

2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:

[FIRM Flood Map.pdf](#)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The FEMA Map Service Center provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use **the best available information** to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site.

Does your project occur in a floodplain?

☒ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

Screen Summary**Compliance Determination**

This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988. The site is entirely within an area designated FEMA Zone X, an Area of Minimum Flood Hazard. This designation was effective June 16, 2011 and is shown on the FIRMette map exported August 9, 2019.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Historic Preservation

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Regulations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) require a consultative process to identify historic properties, assess project impacts on them, and avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)	36 CFR 800 "Protection of Historic Properties" http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx_10/36cfr800_10.html

Threshold

Is Section 106 review required for your project?

No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)

No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].

- ✓ Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

Step 1 – Initiate Consultation

Select all consulting parties below (check all that apply):

- ✓ State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Completed

- ✓ Indian Tribes, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs)

- ✓ Catawba Indian Nation
✓ Delaware Nation,
Oklahoma

Completed

Response Period Elapsed

✓ Pamunkey Indian Tribe Completed

✓ Other Consulting Parties

✓ Arlington County Historic Preservation Program	Completed	Describe the process of
✓ City of Alexandria Archaeology	Completed	
✓ City of Alexandria Board of Architectural Review	Completed Response Period	
✓ Office of Historic Alexandria	Elapsed	

selecting consulting parties and initiating consultation here:

The parties were selected based on their potential interest in the project or potential knowledge of the project area. Emails were sent to Alexandria Archaeology, the Office of Historic Alexandria, and the Arlington Historic Preservation Program inviting them to consult. Letters were sent to the tribes inviting consultation. Alexandria Archaeology declined to consult, but provided a letter documenting their determination the area was unlikely to possess historic significance. The Office of Historic Alexandria did not reply within the response period. The Arlington County Historic Preservation Program concluded the project would have no adverse effect on historic properties. The Pamunkey Indian Tribe declined to consult unless Native American artifacts were found on the site. The Catawba Indian Nation indicated their research led them to believe there were no Catawba artifacts or remains on site but asked to be informed if Native American artifacts were found on site. The Delaware Nation did not reply within the response period.

Document and upload all correspondence, notices and notes (including comments and objections received below).

Step 2 – Identify and Evaluate Historic Properties

1. Define the Area of Potential Effect (APE), either by entering the address(es) or uploading a map depicting the APE below:

See maps.

In the chart below, list historic properties identified and evaluated in the APE. Every historic property that may be affected by the project should be included in the chart.

Upload the documentation (survey forms, Register nominations, concurrence(s) and/or

objection(s), notes, and photos) that justify your National Register Status determination below.

Address / Location / District	National Register Status	SHPO Concurrence	Sensitive Information
Fairlington Historic District, Arlington, VA	Listed	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive

Additional Notes:

2. Was a survey of historic buildings and/or archeological sites done as part of the project?

Yes

✓ No

Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties

Only properties that are listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places receive further consideration under Section 106. Assess the effect(s) of the project by applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect. (36 CFR 800.5)] Consider direct and indirect effects as applicable as per guidance on direct and indirect effects.

Choose one of the findings below - No Historic Properties Affected, No Adverse Effect, or Adverse Effect; and seek concurrence from consulting parties.

No Historic Properties Affected

✓ No Adverse Effect

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Document reason for finding:

While there are historic properties in the vicinity of the project site, namely the Fairlington National Historic District, they will not be adversely affected by the project because the project site is located across a street from historic properties and behind the Fairlington Presbyterian Church, which shields the

project from view.

Does the No Adverse Effect finding contain conditions?

Yes (check all that apply)

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload concurrence(s) or objection(s) below.

Adverse Effect

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. This determination is based on the location of the project, which has no historic properties within its area of direct effect and historic properties within a small area of indirect effect. The historic properties are not near the project site and are separated from the site by a major roadway and a church. The church building will block the view of most of the project, reducing any small impact on the historic properties. The following parties concur with this determination (their concurrences are attached): City of Alexandria (COA) Archaeology COA Board of Architectural Review staff Arlington County Historic Preservation Program staff Virginia Department of Historic Resources (SHPO) Pamunkey Indian Tribe Catawba Indian Nation The Delaware Nation, Oklahoma and the Office of Historic Alexandria were invited to consult but did not reply within the response period.

Supporting documentation

[The Waypoint at Fairlington 3846 King Street Alexandria VA DHR File No 2019 4280.pdf](#)

[Arlington HPP Comments Waypoint Sect106.pdf](#)

[BAR letter.docx](#)

[Catawba Concurrence Letter.pdf](#)

[Waypoint Photos.pdf](#)

[Photo Map.pdf](#)

[Staff Response to Archaeology Question.pdf](#)

[Fairlington Final PDF.pdf](#)

[Pamunkey Indian Tribe Consultation Letter.docx](#)

[Delaware Nation Consultation Letter.docx](#)

[Catawba Consult Letter.docx](#)

[VCRIS Indirect APE.pdf](#)

[VCRIS Direct APE.pdf](#)

[USGS with APE.pdf](#)

[Alexandria Archaeology Reponse to Invitation to Consult.msg](#)

[Email to Office of Historic Alexandria.msg](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Noise Abatement and Control

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD's noise regulations protect residential properties from excessive noise exposure. HUD encourages mitigation as appropriate.	Noise Control Act of 1972 General Services Administration Federal Management Circular 75-2: "Compatible Land Uses at Federal Airfields"	Title 24 CFR 51 Subpart B

1. What activities does your project involve? Check all that apply:

- ☒ New construction for residential use

NOTE: HUD assistance to new construction projects is generally prohibited if they are located in an Unacceptable zone, and HUD discourages assistance for new construction projects in Normally Unacceptable zones. See 24 CFR 51.101(a)(3) for further details.

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

A research demonstration project which does not result in new construction or reconstruction

An interstate land sales registration

Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster
None of the above

4. Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the vicinity (1000' from a major road, 3000' from a railroad, or 15 miles from an airport).

Indicate the findings of the Preliminary Screening below:

There are no noise generators found within the threshold distances above.

- ✓ Noise generators were found within the threshold distances.

5. **Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the**

- ✓ Acceptable: (65 decibels or less; the ceiling may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a))

Indicate noise level here: 62

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

Normally Unacceptable: (Above 65 decibels but not exceeding 75 decibels; the floor may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a))

Unacceptable: (Above 75 decibels)

HUD strongly encourages conversion of noise-exposed sites to land uses compatible with high noise levels.

Check here to affirm that you have considered converting this property to a non-residential use compatible with high noise levels.

Indicate noise level here: 62

Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

A Noise Assessment was conducted. Exhibit V-9 on page 71 of the FAR PART 150 NOISE EXPOSURE MAPS AND NOISE COMPATIBILITY PROGRAM for Ronald Reagan National Airport was used to determine the level of airplane noise exposure. Sheet C-0402 of the Final Site Plan for the Fairlington Presbyterian Development was used to determine the closest part of the building relative to the property line and surrounding streets. Average Daily Traffic counts were obtained from the Virginia Department of Transportation on 11/25/19 (<https://www.virginiaroads.org/datasets/traffic-volume>). The distance between the building and roads was calculated in ArcGIS. There are no

railroads within 1,000 feet of the site. The noise level was acceptable: 62.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. (As N Van Dorn St is classified as a minor arterial by VA DOT, the distance between the building and the intersection of N Van Dorn St and Menokin Dr was used as the effective distance. The effective distance to King St was calculated as the distance to the King St principal arterial and not to the local road that parallels it, as the VA DOT traffic counts are for the principal arterial, not the local road.)

Supporting documentation[Noise Distance Map.pdf](#)[Traffic Volume.csv](#)[ER Attachment IIa Volume 1 Noise Exposure Maps.pdf](#)[DNL Calculator.pdf](#)**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

☒ No

Sole Source Aquifers

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 protects drinking water systems which are the sole or principal drinking water source for an area and which, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health.	Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 201, 300f et seq., and 21 U.S.C. 349)	40 CFR Part 149

1. Does the project consist solely of acquisition, leasing, or rehabilitation of an existing building(s)?

Yes

✓ No

2. Is the project located on a sole source aquifer (SSA)?

A sole source aquifer is defined as an aquifer that supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the aquifer. This includes streamflow source areas, which are upstream areas of losing streams that flow into the recharge area.

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload documentation used to make your determination, such as a map of your project (or jurisdiction, if appropriate) in relation to the nearest SSA and its source area, below.

Yes

Screen Summary**Compliance Determination**

The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. As shown on the map generated on September 19, 2019, there are no sole source aquifers in the City of Alexandria. The project is located entirely within the City of Alexandria.

Supporting documentation

[Sole Source Aquifer Map.png](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wetlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11990 discourages direct or indirect support of new construction impacting wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. The Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wetlands Inventory can be used as a primary screening tool, but observed or known wetlands not indicated on NWI maps must also be processed. Off-site impacts that result in draining, impounding, or destroying wetlands must also be processed.	Executive Order 11990	24 CFR 55.20 can be used for general guidance regarding the 8 Step Process.

1. Does this project involve new construction as defined in Executive Order 11990, expansion of a building's footprint, or ground disturbance? The term "new construction" shall include draining, dredging, channelizing, filling, diking, impounding, and related activities and any structures or facilities begun or authorized after the effective date of the Order

No

✓ Yes

2. Will the new construction or other ground disturbance impact an on- or off-site wetland? The term "wetlands" means those areas that are inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances does or would support, a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas such as sloughs, potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds.

"Wetlands under E.O. 11990 include isolated and non-jurisdictional wetlands."

✓ No, a wetland will not be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990's definition of new construction.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload a map or any other relevant documentation below which explains your determination

Yes, there is a wetland that be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990's definition of new construction.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. See attached map generated on September 26, 2019.

Supporting documentation

[The Waypoint Environmental Assessment Map - Wetlands.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provides federal protection for certain free-flowing, wild, scenic and recreational rivers designated as components or potential components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS) from the effects of construction or development.	The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287), particularly section 7(b) and (c) (16 U.S.C. 1278(b) and (c))	36 CFR Part 297

1. Is your project within proximity of a NWSRS river?

✓ No

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River.

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River.

Screen Summary**Compliance Determination**

This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. See the attached map generated 9/26/19.

Supporting documentation

[The Waypoint Environmental Assessment Rivers Map.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Environmental Justice

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Determine if the project creates adverse environmental impacts upon a low-income or minority community. If it does, engage the community in meaningful participation about mitigating the impacts or move the project.	Executive Order 12898	

HUD strongly encourages starting the Environmental Justice analysis only after all other laws and authorities, including Environmental Assessment factors if necessary, have been completed.

1. Were any adverse environmental impacts identified in any other compliance review portion of this project's total environmental review?

Yes

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Screen Summary**Compliance Determination**

No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No